



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,635	07/26/2000	Kevin R. Boyle	PHB 34,367	9407

7590

09/11/2002

Corporate Patent Counsel
U S Philips Corporation
580 White Plains Road
Tarrytown, NY 10591

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SHARAD K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2683

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/616,635

Applicant(s)

BOYLE, KEVIN R.

Examiner

Sharad Rampuria

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,4. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because is too long, it should be less than one paragraph. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claim 1-2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Charlier et al.

1. Regarding Claim 1, Charlier disclosed A body-worn personal communications apparatus comprising an antenna and a casing, the casing having disposed within it transceiver circuitry, (Col.3; 1-44), characterised in that the antenna is a physically-shortened electric antenna. (36; Fig.3; Col.3; 25-30)

2. Regarding Claim 2, Charlier disclosed An apparatus as claimed in claim 1, characterised in that the physically-shortened electric antenna is a helical antenna. (Col.6; 23-29)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2683

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 7, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlier et al. in view of Haulihan.

5. Regarding Claim 5, Charlier disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the microphone is located at the end of the antenna furthest from the casing. However, Haulihan teaches in an analogous art, that An apparatus as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a microphone, characterised in that the microphone is located at the end of the antenna furthest from the casing. (134; Fig.1; Col.3; 27-40) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the microphone is located at the end of the antenna furthest from the casing in order to use as a telephone.

17 7. Regarding Claim 7, Charlier disclosed An apparatus as claimed in claim 5, characterised in that the antenna is formed and in that a first electrical connection between the microphone and the transceiver circuitry is provided by and in that a second electrical connection between the microphone and the transceiver circuitry is provided by a conductor enclosed. (Col.3; 1-7). Charlier fails to disclose a hollow wire. However, Haulihan teaches in an analogous art, that a hollow wire (Col.3; 41-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a hollow wire in order to use its hollowness.

9. Regarding Claim 9, Charlier disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the microphone is located at the end of the antenna furthest from the casing. However, Haulihan teaches in an analogous art, that An apparatus as claimed in claim 5 characterised in that the microphone

Art Unit: 2683

provides top loading to the antenna. (134; Fig. 1; Col.3; 27-40) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the microphone is located at the end of the antenna furthest from the casing in order to use as a telephone.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlier et al. , in view of Hirai et al.

12 3. Regarding Claim 3, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except a meander-line antenna. However, Hirai teaches in an analogous art, that An apparatus as claimed in claim 1, characterised in that the physically-shortened electric antenna is a meander-line antenna. (16; Fig. 1; Col.3; 11-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a meander-line antenna in order to minimize the space required for the antenna.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlier et al., in view of Barnard (WO 00/13329).

13 4. Regarding Claim 4, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the antenna is mounted transversely to a plane through the casing. However, Barnard teaches in an analogous art, that An apparatus as claimed in characterised in that the antenna is mounted transversely to a plane through the casing. (in the casing; Col.5; 22-28). Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2683

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the antenna is mounted transversely to a plane through the casing in order to provide a low bandwidth.

Claims 6, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlier et al. , in view of McLean (GB 2036447).

15, 16 6. Regarding Claim 6, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the coaxial cable. However, McLean teaches in an analogous art, that An apparatus as claimed in claim 5, characterised in that the antenna is formed from coaxial cable and in that the coaxial cable provides electrical connections between the microphone and the transceiver circuitry. (Page.2; 45-59) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the coaxial cable in order to use the thickness of cable.

10 8. Regarding Claim 8, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the coaxial cable. However, McLean teaches in an analogous art, that An apparatus as claimed in claim 6, characterised in that the microphone provides a low impedance at radio frequencies, thereby enabling the coaxial cable forming the antenna to act as an inductive stub. (Page.2; 45-64) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the coaxial cable in order to use the thickness of cable.

Art Unit: 2683

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is 703-308-4736. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.(8:05-5:35) alternate Fri.(8:05-4:35).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

SK

September 6, 2002